



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/686,992	10/16/2003	David C. Coffin	6579-76-1	7459
7590	04/07/2004			EXAMINER
Richard R. Michaud McCormick, Paulding & Huber LLP CityPlace II 185 Asylum Street Hartford, CT 06103			PAYER, HWEI SIU CHOU	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3724	
DATE MAILED: 04/07/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/686,992	COFFIN ET AL.
	Examiner Hwei-Siu C. Payer	Art Unit 3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-13, 17 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 14-16 and 19-26 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

Detailed Action

Claim Objection

Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 13, lines 5 and 6, "the first drain channels" and "the first and second drain channels" should read --the first channels-- and --the first and second channels--, respectively.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claims Rejection - 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrews (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,875) in view of Trotta (U.S. Patent No. 5,084,968).

Andrews discloses a wet shaving razor (Figs.10-11) for bi-directional shaving comprising: a handle (202); a housing (201) coupled to the handle (202), the housing (201) including a lower housing member and an upper housing member cooperating to

define a cavity (205,206); and first and second blade assemblies (203,204) disposed within the cavity (205,206), each of the first and second blade assemblies (203,204) including at least one blade (220,221,223,224) defining a cutting edge substantially as claimed except for the orientation of the blades. Specifically, in Andrews, the cutting edge of the at least one blade (220/221) of the first blade assembly (203) faces away rather than toward the cutting edge of the at least one blade (223/224) of the second blade assembly (204).

Troatta shows that it is desirable to have two cutting blades (20,22) facing toward each other to permit bi-directional shaving.

In view of this fact, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time this invention was made to modify Andrews by rearranging/reversing the position of the two blade assemblies (203,204) so that the cutting edge of the at least one blade of the first blade assembly faces toward the cutting edge of the at least one blade of the second blade assembly to permit bi-directional shaving. The modification is obvious since it would only involve selecting one known blade arrangement for another for bi-directional shaving.

With respect to claim 18, Andrews teaches (Fig.17-20) releasably coupling the housing to the handle. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to further modify the wet shaving razor of (Figs.10-11) by releasably coupling the housing (201) to the handle (202).

3. Claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrews (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,875) and Trotta (U.S. Patent No. 5,084,968) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Andrews (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,288).

The blade cartridge (201) of Andrews '875 as modified above shows all the claimed structure except the blades are not movable into the razor housing in response to shaving force.

Andrews '288 shows (Fig.53) razor blades (764,771) movable into the razor housing by means of resilient members (761,762) in response to shaving force.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to further modify Andrews '875 by having the razor blades movable into the razor housing by means of resilient members to provide a close shave as taught by Andrews '288.

4. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrews (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,875), Trotta (U.S. Patent No. 5,084,968) and Andrews (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,288) as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Clark (U.S. Patent No. 6,397,473).

The blade cartridge (201) of Andrews '875 as modified above shows all the claimed structure except the resilient members are not spring wires bowed rearwardly of the blades.

Clark shows (Fig.2) a spring member (20) bowed rearwardly of the blade to provide a restoring force to the blade.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to further modify Andrews '875 by having the resilient members bowed rearwardly of the blades to facilitate restoring the blades to their rest position. The modification is obvious since it would only involve selecting one known type of resilient members for another for providing a restoring force to the razor blades.

5. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrews (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,875) and Trotta (U.S. Patent No. 5,084,968) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Althaus et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,579,580).

The blade cartridge (201) of Andrews as modified above shows all the claimed structure except it lacks a wire wound along the cutting edges of the blades.

Althaus et al. show a blade cartridge (1) comprising a wire (17) wound along the cutting edges of the blades (8,9,10,11) for preventing skin from extruding between the blades.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to further modify Andrews by providing a wire wound along the cutting edges of the blades as taught by Althaus et al. for the intended purpose as set forth.

6. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrews (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,875) and Trotta (U.S. Patent No. 5,084,968) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Chen (U.S. Patent No. 5,003,694).

The blade cartridge (201) of Andrews '875 as modified above shows all the claimed structure except the housing lacks a plurality of channels extending between the side ends of the blade cartridge to facilitate flushing of debris.

Chen shows a blade housing comprising a plurality of channels (i.e. the channels defined between adjacent guards 21, see Fig.1) extending between side ends of the housing for facilitating flushing of shaving debris.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to further modify Andrews '875 by providing the housing with channels extending between side ends of the housing as taught by Chen for the intended purpose as set forth.

7. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrews (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,875) and Trotta (U.S. Patent No. 5,084,968) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Andrews (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,288).

The blade cartridge (201) of Andrews '875 as modified above shows all the claimed structure except the housing lacks a plurality of channels extending between the longitudinal ends of the blade cartridge to facilitate flushing of debris.

Andrews '288 shows (Fig.11) a blade cartridge housing (160) comprising a plurality of channels (165,167) between the longitudinal ends thereof for facilitating flushing of shaving debris.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to further modify Andrews '875 by providing the housing with longitudinally extending channels as taught by Andrews '288 for the intended purpose as set forth.

8. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrews (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,875) and Trotta (U.S. Patent No. 5,084,968) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Chen (U.S. Patent No. 5,003,694) and Andrews (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,288).

The blade cartridge (201) of Andrews '875 as modified above shows all the claimed structure except the housing lacks a plurality of channels extending between the side ends of the blade cartridge and a plurality of channels extending between the longitudinal ends of the blade cartridge to facilitate flushing of debris.

Chen shows a blade housing comprising a plurality of channels (i.e. the channels defined between adjacent guards 21, see Fig.1) extending between side ends of the housing, and Andrews '288 shows a blade cartridge housing (160) comprising a plurality of channels (165,167) extending between the longitudinal ends thereof for facilitating flushing of shaving debris.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to further modify Andrews '875 by providing the housing with channels extending between side ends thereof and with channel extending longitudinally thereof as taught by Chen and Andrews '288, respectively, for facilitate flushing of shaving debris.

Indication of Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 14-16 and 19-26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Prior Art Citations

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Muros, Nissen et al., Coffin et al. and Coffin are cited as art of interest.

Point of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hwei-Siu C. Payer whose telephone number is 703-308-1405. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 7:00 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan N. Shoap can be reached on 703-308-1082. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for official communications and 703-746-3293 for proposed amendments.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.

H Payer
April 5, 2004

18-1 Payer

Hazel-Siu Payer
Primary Examiner